



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/216,078	12/18/98	NI	C 016517-00380

020350 . MM22/1222
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

EXAMINER

GARCIA, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2823

DATE MAILED:

12/22/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/216,078

Applicant(s)
Hsinchu et al

Examiner
Joannie Adelle Garcia

Group Art Unit
2823



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) 18 and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 17, 20, 22, and 23 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) ~~2, 4, 6, 9, 11-16, and 21~~ 2 & 6 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit 2823

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 9, line 4-5, it is unclear what are the units for the temperature range.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 11-16, and 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "dielectric layer" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In claim 9, line 5, "or" should be replaced by --and--.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "said first region" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit 2823

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 17, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi.

Takagi discloses selective implantation of region A followed by differential oxide growth over layer 2. He does not specifically disclose the use of halogen as the ion source. It will be a matter of routine optimization to select a particular ion to achieve the desired properties of the oxide film produced. A substrate produced would be suitable as a substrate for formation of a flash EPROM or a high voltage device.

Claim 17 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Do to the subjectivity associated with the term high as discussed above, claim 17 does not limit the process step of claim 1.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 20-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for simultaneously forming different thickness of dielectric by thermal oxidation, does not reasonably provide enablement for recitation of simultaneously forming

Art Unit 2823

different thicknesses of dielectric material broadly. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. There are no alternatives disclosed and therefore, insufficient discussion on how to perform these methods.

2 and 6
~~2, 6, 18 and 19~~

Claims ^{2 and 6}~~2, 4, 6, 9, 11-16, and 21~~ are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 11-16 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action *and to include all the limitations of the base claim.*

Art Unit 2823

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956. **See MPEP 203.08.**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner J. Garcia whose telephone number is (703) 306-5733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (703) 308-4918. The fax number for this group is (703)308-7722 (and 7724 and 7382). MPEP 502.01 contains instructions regarding procedures used in submitting responses by facsimile transmission.



JAG

December 17, 1999



George Foyrson

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2823